

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/601,345 | Applicant(s) UITTERLINDEN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Katherine Salmon | Art Unit 1634 | |

All Participants:

 (1) Katherine Salmon.

 (2) Darla Yoerg.
Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 October 2007
Time: 4pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

6,8-12, 21, 24, 29-30

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed putting the claims in condition for allowance.

Ms. Yoerg agreed to cancel claims 21 and 24 and therefore the claims could be entered without further search and consideration as discussed in the advisory action (mail date 8/30/2007).

With regard to Claim 12, Ms. Yoerg agreed to the examiners amendment to remove the term "prevent" from Claim 12 so that the claims is drawn to a method to reduce the risk.

With regard to Claim 8, the claim should have been objected to because the claim fails to further limit Claim 6. Ms. Yoerg agreed to cancel Claim 8 such that the rejection would be moot. Further Ms. Yoerg agreed to amend claim 9 so that it is dependent on Claim 6.